

REGARDING RESEARCH INTO THE LINGUISTIC INTERFERENCE OF CZECH AND RUSSIAN AT THE INITIAL STAGE OF TEACHING RUSSIAN AS A SECOND FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Renée Grenarová

(CZECH REPUBLIC)

renee.grenarova@seznam.cz

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2015/6-2/56

Received: 14 Feb, 2015

Accepted: 27 Mar, 2015

ABSTRACT

The implemented research focuses on the language interference of Czech and Russian as closely related languages at the initial stage of teaching Russian as a second foreign language in primary schools. In the initial stage of Russian study as a second foreign language in primary schools it is necessary to take into account the manifestations of linguistic interference and work on them actively.

Key words: research; Russian language teaching; linguistic interference; Russian language; Czech language; pupils and students; second foreign language

1. INTRODUCTION

The interaction of languages, i.e. language contact plays an important role in foreign language teaching, i.e. whether we are talking about contact between the mother and foreign language, or between two foreign languages – a 1st and 2nd foreign language, or another foreign language (interlingual transfer) or acting in one language (intralingual transfer). Given the fact that Russian and Czech are closely related languages, reference to the mother tongue has its importance in the didactics of the Russian language for Czech students.

The implemented research focuses on the language interference of Czech and Russian as closely related languages at the initial stage of teaching Russian as a second foreign language in primary schools. The aim of the research, carried out in 2010–2015, was to determine what problems caused by the interlingual and intralingual interference students face in spontaneous verbal communication in Russian language. Based on the analysis of the data obtained from experimental investigation, some specific recommendations are formulated as recommendations for overcoming interlingual and intralingual interference at the initial stage of teaching Russian as a second foreign language in primary schools.

2. INTERFERENCE, ITS CLASSIFICATION AND COMMUNICATION IN THE RUSSIAN-CZECH LANGUAGE PLAN

The new *Academic Dictionary of Foreign Words* (1) defines interference in the pedagogical sense of the word as "the negative influence of already acquired properties when learning something new (op.transfer): i. of the mother tongue when learning a foreign language". Veselý (2) clarifies the definition: "In theory, foreign language teaching interference is understood as a distortion of the standard when using a foreign language, either due to the effects of the mother tongue or other phenomena that influence the foreign language." Liškář (3) supports the same concept as Veselý. Interference is a significant correlation variable in the process of learning a foreign language. For example, in the *Teaching Foreign Languages* publication, Choděra (4) states its various forms and comments on the various opinions regarding the progression of interference. It states (5) that "interference is a constant factor in the acquisition and use of a foreign language. Its knowledge is one of the basic conditions for successful management of foreign language learning."

We build on Veselý's classification of linguistic interference and distinguish:

- Interlingual and intralingual:
 - Interlingual, e.g.: erroneously *Летом он побывал на Словакии.*, correctly *Летом он побывал в Словакии.* etc.;
 - Intralingual, e.g.: present tense verbs *танцевать, беседовать* – erroneously *я танцеваю, я беседоваю* instead of the correctly *я танцую, я беседую* etc.;
- Obvious and hidden:
 - Obvious, e.g.: erroneously used concept, indicating that "someone likes doing something, devotes themselves to something, enjoys something" *Я рад читаю книги.*, instead of the correct expression of the phrase *Я люблю читать книги.* etc.;
 - Hidden, e.g.: erroneously *Меня болит рука.* instead of the correct expression of the phrase in Russian *У меня болит рука.* etc.;
- According to the language plans:
 - Sound – e.g.: pronunciation of soft "л", e.g.: *мальчик, деталь, больница* etc.;
 - Graphic – e.g.: grapheme substitution, i.e. *upsilon* from Latin to Cyrillic, i.e. *руба* instead of correct *рыба*, *муло* instead of correct *мыло*, *круша* instead of correct *крыша* etc.;
 - Spelling – e.g.: transfer of an orthographic rule for writing "i – y" after the consonants "g, k, ch" from Czech into Russian, e.g.: erroneously *книгы, лодкы, мухы* instead of correct *книги, лодки, мухи* etc.;

- Morphological – e.g.: erroneously *они показали отцови, Петрови, дядю/и/ови* instead of correct *они показали отцу, Петру, дяде* etc.;
- Lexical – e.g.: a translation of the word *fresh* in the phrase *fresh air* incorrectly as *черствый воздух* instead of *свежий воздух*; Czech phrase *beautiful life* into Russian incorrectly as *красный живот* instead of *красивая жизнь*; Czech term *janitor* into Russian incorrectly as *школьник* instead of the correct translation as the phrase *школьный сторож* (while the Russian term *школьник* means *student* in Czech) etc.;
- Syntactic – e.g.: in formal language, i.e. in Czech the phrase *Be so kind* is incorrectly translated into Russian as *Будьте так добра* instead of *Будьте так добры*. etc.

In our research we focus on the influential role of intralingual and interlingual interference, i.e. interlingual and intralingual negative transfer in the spontaneous verbal communication of pupils and students at the initial stage of teaching Russian as a second foreign language in primary schools.

3. OBJECTIVES AND METHODS OF RESEARCH, EXAMINED SAMPLE AND EXECUTION OF RESEARCH INVESTIGATIONS REGARDING THE INTERFERENCE'S PRONOUNCEMENTS IN THE TEACHING OF RUSSIAN

The aim of the experimental qualitative survey was to investigate the influence of interlingual and intralingual interference and the resulting difficulties faced by students in the spontaneous verbal communication of pupils and students at the initial stage of teaching Russian as closely related language and as a second foreign language in primary schools. A comparative linguistic analysis and the analysis of student errors based on student monitoring was chosen as the investigation method, i.e. the monitoring of students' verbal expressing in the classroom, the comparative linguistic analysis of interference difficulties and the analysis of interference errors.

25 students were monitored for a period of 5 years. The observations were always made in two stages – at the end of the first semester of the respective school year and at the end of the second semester of the same school year. The transcript of the obtained Russian-speaking audio recording of the students' verbal expressing from an MP3 player, a comparative linguistic analysis of spontaneous verbal expressing, and an analysis of student errors in verbal expressing were always performed by the author in January and June of the respective school year.

4. THE RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION OF LINGUISTIC CORRECTNESS IN THE FORM OF LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS AND AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT INTERFERENCE ERRORS

The following aspect was applied in the experimental verification of the linguistic correctness of students' spontaneous foreign language verbal expressing in the form of linguistic analysis, and an analysis of student interference errors through observation:

- formal observation;
- semantic observation;
- valenced observation;
- functional-stylistic, and stylistic observation.

Expressions of interlingual and intralingual interference in the phonetic and phonological production area in students' verbal expressing: Based on the experimental investigations of students' verbal expressing, the phonetic-phonological production area of acoustic language aspect was examined – pronunciation of segmental and suprasegmental elements. These most common types of problems were found (see Table 1).

Table 1. Expressions of interlingual and intralingual interference in the phonetic and phonological production area in students' verbal expressing

Interference differences in pronunciation between Czech and Russian segmental components, i.e. consonants and vowels	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-differentiation between Russian pronunciation of soft and hard "л", e.g.: <i>большой, волна, плыть, голубой, болеть</i> etc. 2. Mispronunciation (insufficient hardness) in Russian always in hard consonants "з, ш, с", e.g.: <i>ждать, жизнь, крыша, тише, цирк, цыпленок</i> etc. 3. Mispronunciation (insufficient softness) in Russian always in soft consonants "ж, щ, ж", e.g.: <i>число, читать, борщ, еще, сейчас, балалайка</i> etc. 4. Mispronunciation (insufficient hardness) in hard consonants "д, т, н, м", e.g.: <i>другой, туда, ныне, мыло</i> etc. 5. Inadequate or missing softening in syllables "de, te, ne" or its complete absence, e.g.: <i>дети, вы читаете, вы идете, я не знаю</i> etc. 6. Inadequate or absent implementation of the correlation of softness and hardness in consonants "р, р", e.g.: <i>резать, ребята, рыба, пять, пельмени, лить</i> etc. 7. Insufficient or no reduction of vocals in pretone and aftertone syllabic position, e.g.: <i>город, молоко, бабушка</i> etc. 8. Non-differentiation in pronunciation in Russian soft and hard "йу", e.g.: <i>сыр, быть, билль, сын, рисование, рыба</i> etc. 9. Mispronunciation of J-toned sounds (pronounced like "й"), e.g.: <i>мясо, еще, меня</i> etc. 10. Insufficient or no binding of prepositions, e.g.: <i>в этом случае, они говорили обо мне, в августе</i> etc.
Interference differences in word stressing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficient strength/sharpness and intensity of Russian word stressing, e.g.: <i>он работает, говорить, карандаш, язык</i> etc. 2. Insufficient, incorrect acquisition and inadequate fixation of moving accent, e.g.: <i>ружэ – ружки, гдород – города, дом – дома, слезэ – слезы</i> etc.
Interference differences in the implementation of isentential stressing and intonation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate implementation of descending melody in intonation construction ИК-1, e.g.: <i>Вче/ра/ мы были дома. /Мы/ смотрели телевизор. Потом мы /слу/шали музыку.</i> etc. 2. Inadequate implementation of intonation construction ИК-2, declarative sentences with stressing, questions with interrogative word and falling intonation melody, e.g.: <i>Вче/ра/ мы были дома. Вчера /мы/ были дома. /Как/ тебя зовут? Ку/да/ ты идешь?</i> etc. 3. Inadequate implementation of the sharp increase in tone in the intonation construction ИК-3, e.g.: <i>Это сказал /а/, а не Павел. Книга мо/я/, а не твоя.</i> etc. 4. Inadequate implementation of the two sentential centers of intonation and arched intonation melodic arc of statements in intonation construction ИК-5, e.g.: <i>Ка/кой/ красивый /яв/и/тер! Ка/ка/я хорошая /де/вушка!</i> etc.

Signs of interference in morphology in students' verbal expressing: Morphological interference was investigated during the experimental verification of students' verbal expressing. These types of difficulties were recorded increasingly in the students (see Table 2).

Table 2. Signs of interlingual and intralingual interference in morphology in students' verbal expressing

Nouns	Wrong substitution of Russian suffix with the Czech one, e.g.: <i>отцови, для школы, бабушкови, с жизнью</i> etc.
Pronouns	Confusion of the pronoun form in the 2nd and 4th case with forms for the 3rd and 6th case for personal pronouns, e.g.: <i>к меня, ты ее показал, без тебе я туда не пойду</i> etc.
Verbs	Inadequate fixing of the correct verb forms for the timing of Russian verbs, adding the Czech suffix and verb form according the wrong formula, e.g.: <i>мама преподавает, я рисуюю, вы хотите сказать, я ишла, я могу, ты обедашь и знашь, бабушка умрел, бабушка умрела</i> etc.
Prepositions	Averse transfer of prepositional structure from Czech into Russian, e.g.: <i>Я живу на Моравии. Я жду твой ответ. Это для твоих., интересоs</i> etc.

Speech interference in lexis, i.e. in vocabulary, in students' verbal expressing: lexis – vocabulary was investigated during the experimental investigation of students' verbal expressing. The most common mistakes in their spontaneous spoken include (see Table 3).

Table 3. Speech interference in lexis in students' verbal expressing

Vocabulary	Incorrect use of lexical units, or their semantic confusion, e.g.: <i>рост – возраст, век – возраст, час – урок, час – время, рано – утром</i> etc.
Homonyms	Confusion of homonyms, i.e. the consonants of words (sounding the same), but different with origin and meaning, e.g.: <i>неделя – неделя</i> (neděle – in Russian <i>воскресенье, неделя</i> – in Czech <i>tyden</i>), <i>život – живот</i> (<i>život</i> – in Russian <i>жизнь, живот</i> – in Czech <i>český břícho</i>), <i>magazín</i> (ve významu <i>časopis</i>) – <i>магазин</i> (in Russian <i>журнал, магазин</i> – in Czech <i>obchod</i>) etc.
Paronyms	Misuse of paronyms, i.e. words formally identical or very similar in external appearance, but with different origin and meaning, e.g.: <i>rysovat – рисовать, rysovat</i> a rusky <i>kreslit</i> ve významu <i>malovat</i> etc.

Signs of interlingual and intralingual interference in syntax in students' verbal expressing: The syntactic plan of the Russian language was studied during the experimental verification of the students' verbal expressing. The occurrence of these errors and problems was evaluated as highly frequent (see Table 4).

Table 4. Signs of interlingual and intralingual interference in syntax in students' verbal expressing

The main clauses	Compliance of subject with predicate, e.g. in the construction of formal language, the effort to "transfer" the Czech sentence pattern into Russian, e.g.: <i>Что вы читал? Вы имела правду.</i> etc.
Sentence structures	Improper use of sentence-type models, e.g.: <i>Болí мне голова. – Меня болит голова. Včera mi ukradli učebnici. – Вчера мне украли учебник. Kolik je hodin? – Сколько часов?</i> etc.
Expressing negation	Absence in the use of the negative genitive in Russian, nominative is applied instead, e.g.: <i>У меня нет время. У вас нет дети?, Сестра нет дома.</i> etc.
Sentences with unexpressed nominative	In compliance with Czech, students keep the subject silent in the sentence and ignore the need and (often semantic) binding of its use in Russian, e.g.: <i>Вчера смотрел новый фильм. Узнал, что приедет после обеда. Работали хорошо.</i> etc.
Sentences with nominal predicate without linking verb	Incorrectly used sentence model in the testimony with nominal predicate with a linking verb instead of the Russian model of the nominal predicate without a linking verb for expressing in the present tense, e.g.: <i>Моя мама есть хорошая учительница., У нас есть новая машина. У меня есть старшая сестра. У нас есть новый дом.</i> etc.

Overall, within the partial conclusions from the analysis and the analysis of student errors in verbal spontaneous expressing at the initial stage of teaching Russian as a second foreign language in primary schools, it can be concluded that the linguistic correctness of utterances in students is increasingly influenced by a subjective approach and the students' relationship with communication in general and communication in a foreign language (their "willingness" to communicate and their interest in a foreign language, or also motivation to learn the given foreign language, along with many other factors), their personal individuality (introvert, extrovert), achieved study results (in the 1st foreign and native language), as well as the students' interests and hobbies. Finally, however, the teacher significantly influences the process of learning a foreign language according to our findings.

The successful overcoming of interference can only be aided by the students' consistent work under the guidance of a teacher, as well as efforts for the correct fixation of the linguistic phenomenon by the students, the application of different lexical grammar exercise alternatives based on drilling, as well as the repeated training of the subject in various communication situations, the use of role-playing games, the application of appropriate dramatization elements, a multisensoric and differentiated approach, orderliness, etc.

If a teacher works thoughtfully when dealing with a foreign language while teaching Russian as a second foreign language, the error from interlingual and intralingual interference may so become a source of knowledge and a subsequent lesson, or the starting point for students' motivation for further activities in learning, a topic for work or home preparation. Only the full automation of language means and mastery of complex language skills will allow the student to realize foreign language communication with understanding.

The variety of pitfalls that the close relationship of both languages brings must be borne in mind when learning Russian as closely related language and as a second foreign language in primary schools, e.g. handling the role of the so-called. "faux amis or false, and treacherous friends" in the Czech-Russian linguistic plan, acquiring entire sentence structures and formulas – phrases. The teacher must carefully apply consideration for the students, a differentiated and individualized approach, choose the most appropriate principles and working practices, encourage students to apply the learning styles appropriate to them, and put an emphasis on the development of self-reflection, self-evaluation and assessment when taking this into consideration. It is necessary to encourage student autonomy and their own share of responsibility for the outcome of learning Russian.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OVERCOMING INTERLINGUAL AND INTRALINGUAL INTERFERENCE PROBLEMS AT THE INITIAL STAGE OF TEACHING RUSSIAN AS A SECOND FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

With regard to the current requirements of practice and the implementation of foreign language education, it is appropriate today to apply the principles for the creation, organization and implementation of language exercises to overcome interference in the daily practice of teaching Russian as a second foreign language, which were outlined by Veselý years ago, but have still remained valid:

- Differentiation of simple and complex language phenomena;

- Gradation of difficulty in the adopted language material and language phenomena;
- Applying and using a contrastive approach and comparing linguistic phenomena;
- Applying and using a longer time perspective, along with the stimulation of the student's long-term memory with the help of repetition and automation of linguistic phenomena from one context into a different context and linguistic coherency.

This list of principles for the creation, organization and realization of the Czech and Russian exercises to eliminate interference will be extended with the need for:

- Empathy, patience, passion, consistency and fairness on the part of the teacher;
- The selection of a suitable creative and positive approach, working methods and strategies, methodological tools, educational materials, individualization, switching between activities, learning self-reflection, autonomy, evaluation and self-evaluation;
- Minimizing distractions in the classroom and in their own training, striving for a calm environment, a focused and relaxed atmosphere in the classroom;
- Motivation and its importance, students' attention and its maintenance;
- Regular mutual communication among all participants in the educational process, i.e. the teacher – student – parents.
- Switching and diversity of activities, and other.

In the process of language training and fixation we distinguish these stages:

- Stage of zero automation – typical for the initial phases of education;
- Stage of semi-automation – sometimes it is necessary to remember applicable theoretical rules for the proper practical use of language means;
- Stage of full automation – the student comprehensively mastered the foreign language, consciously and adequately uses the foreign language means, fully competent.

6. CONCLUSION

In the initial stage of Russian study as a second foreign language in primary schools it is necessary to take into account the manifestations of linguistic interference and work on them actively. To make the teaching process successful, the teacher must encourage students, inter alia, towards deliberate work with errors, which also includes the overcoming of interference problems in studying Russian as a second foreign language.

It would be ideal to completely prevent interference mistakes, but in language teaching practice, it is an entirely unrealistic assumption. Therefore, it is highly desirable that based on the analysis of errors and specific problems, the Russian teacher could purposefully lead to the systematic overcoming and ongoing elimination of interference problems. The teacher should apply the principle of arranging the curriculum from simpler to more difficult, i.e. after overcoming the obvious interference the students should proceed to overcome hidden interference, i.e. the teacher should intelligently lead them to the acquisition and subsequent fixation of idiomatic forms of expressing. For this purpose, it is advisable to draw up and methodically treat a set of spelling, grammatical, lexical-grammatical and lexical exercises using teaching language games in a classical and

REFERENCES

1. Kraus, J. Akademický slovník cizích slov. Academia, Praha, Czech Republic, 2001, p. 339.
2. Veselý, J. Problematika vyučování ruštině jako blízké příbuznému jazyku. SPN, Praha, Czech Republic, 1981, p. 28.
3. Liškář, Č. Transfer a interference vy vyučování cizím jazykům. Krajský pedagogický ústav v Brně, Brno, Czech Republic, 1970, p. 10.
4. Choděra, R. Didaktika cizích jazyků. Academia, Praha, Czech Republic, 2006, p. 50.
5. Choděra, R. Didaktika cizích jazyků. Academia, Praha, Czech Republic, 2006, p. 51.